UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/947,435	10/08/97	FERGUSON D	004966-005

LM02/0916

JAMES W PETERSON
BURNS DOANE SWECKER AND MATHIS
P O BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER	
COLBERT,E	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2771	7

DATE MAILED: 09/16/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
08/947,435	Ferguson et al
Examiner	**Group Art Unit**
Ella Colbert	2771

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Aug 5, 1999* .

☒ This action is **FINAL.**

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire *Three* month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) *1-28, 30-51, and 53-83* is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) *1-28, 30-46, and 51* is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) *47-50 and 53-83* is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐approved ☐disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____ .

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-83 are presented for examination.

2. The prior Office Action is included by reference.

3. Those applicable sections of Title 35 of United States Code not presented herein were presented in an earlier Office Action.

4. Applicant's response of 5 August 1999 to the Office Action has been entered as Amendment A, paper number 6.

5. Applicant's arguments are moot in view of the new prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zarmer et al (US 5,625,818), hereafter Zarmer.

In regard to claim 1, "importing a document having a first format into a collection or documents in the computer system" (**column 6, lines 19-40**), wherein the collection of documents is organized within the computer system in accordance with a hierarchy of electronic folders"

"storing the document in a memory location" (**column 7, lines 18-27, column 12, lines 41-48, and column 18, 17-23**), "automatically extracting attribute data from the document" (**column 18, lines 24-34**) and "generating a data structure for the document" (**column 23. Lines 40-51 and column 24, 48-63**), "wherein said data structure contains the attribute data in a second format independent of the said first format" (**column 24, lines 6-18 and column 4, lines 41-49**) and "linking the imported document to a first electronic folder" (**column 6, 12-15 and lines 35-40**). "Wherein the data structure is stored and maintained in memory separate from the imported document" and "if the attribute data contained in the data structure matches a set of predefined criteria corresponding to the first electronic folder" was not disclosed by Zarmer, but it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art of data structures and attribute data to have a set of predefined criteria because the information in the data structure is arranged a certain way in the computer memory with the attributes in the data structure being those of files marked as hidden, read-only, and archive.

In regard to claim 2, "optically scanning a paper-based document" and converting the optically scanned document into an electronic document (**column 4, lines 27-37 and lines 38-55**).

8. Claims 3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zarmer in view of Fujisawa et al (5,628,003), hereafter Fujisawa.

In regard to claim 3, Zarmer did not disclose "wherein the first format is an image format."

Fujisawa disclosed this in **column 7, in particular lines 13-23**. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art of first formats to have an image format and to combine Zarmer's document with a first format with Fujisawa's first format being an image because many word processing programs have the ability to import the text and graphics from other file formats.

In regard to claim 4, Zarmer did not disclose "wherein the first format is a text format."

Fujisawa disclosed this in **column 1, lines 63-67**. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art of formats to have a text format and to combine Zarmer's collection of documents with Fujisawa's first format being a text format because the importing is a type of file conversion with word processing programs having the ability to import text from several file formats.

In regard to claim 5, Zarmer did not disclose "importing an electronic document."

Fujisawa disclosed this in **column 1, lines 30-38**. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art of importing documents to have a electronic document and to combine Zarmer's collection of documents with Fujisawa's document importing because an electronic document has the ability to have text and graphics from several file formats when being loaded from a format other than the application program's native format.

In regard to claim 6, Zarmer did not disclose "wherein the first format is a text format."

Fujisawa disclosed this in **column 1, lines 63-67 and column 2, lines 1-5**. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art of first

formats to have a text format and to combine Zarmer's management of a collection of documents with Fujisawa's first format being a text format because the importing is a type of file conversion with word processing programs having the ability to import text from several file formats.

In regard to claim 7, Zarmer nor Fujisawa did not disclose "wherein the document is a word processing document," but it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of documents at the time the invention was made for the document to be a word processing document because word processing is prepared in clearly worded, readable text without elaborate design or typography.

In regard to claim 8, Zarmer nor Fujisawa disclosed "wherein the document is an e-mail message," but it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of documents at the time the invention was made for the document to be an e-mail message because e-mail documents are much more convenient than ordinary mail or telephone calls since it arrives immediately but doesn't require a recipient to be present.

In regard to claim 9, Zarmer did not disclose "wherein the first format is an image format."

Fujisawa disclosed this in **column 7, lines 13-23**). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art of first formats to have an image format and to combine Zarmer's document with a first format with Fujisawa's first format being an image because many word processing programs have the ability to import the text and graphics from other file formats.

In regard to claim 10, "wherein the first format is an HTML format" was not disclosed by Zarmer nor Fujisawa, but it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of formats at the time the invention was made for the document to be in HTML format because HTML (Hypertext Markup Language) is a set of codes that can be inserted into text files to indicate special features such as typefaces, inserted images and links to other hypertext documents on the Internet and almost any word processor or page layout can be used to produce HTML.

9. Claims 11-28 and 30-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zarmer and Fujisawa and further in view of Malone et al (5,727,175), hereafter Malone.

In regard to claim 11, "wherein the second format comprises as least one data field" was not disclosed by Zarmer nor Fujisawa.

Malone disclosed this in **column 5, lines 2-16**. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art of second formats to have a data field and to combine Zarmer's first format and Fujisawa's first image format with Malone's second format comprising a data field because the field contains a "single fact" of data information relating to the document.

In regard to claim 12, Zarmer nor Fujisawa disclosed "wherein the at least one data field contains a file name" was not disclosed by Zarmer nor Fujisawa.

Malone disclosed this in **column 7, lines 8-15 and column 9, lines 29-49**. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art of data fields to have a file name and to combine Zarmer's hierarchy of folders and Fujisawa's text format

with Malone's data field containing a file name because the contents of a data field contains a "single fact" relating to the name the user gave the file for later retrieval.

In regard to claim 13, "wherein the at least one data field contains the memory location" was not disclosed by Zarmer, Fujisawa, nor Malone, but it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art of memory locations to have a data field because information while being worked on is stored in the memory.

In regard to claim 14, "wherein the data field contains a bit map" was not disclosed by Zarmer nor Fujisawa.

Malone disclosed this in **column 6, lines 18-33**. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art of data fields to have a bit map and to combine Zarmer's data structure and Fujisawa's image format with Malone's data field containing a bit map because the bitmaps can be imported into other application programs such as word processing programs.

In regard to claim 15, Zarmer, Fujisawa, nor Malone disclosed "wherein the data field contains raw text" was disclosed by Zarmer, Fujisawa, nor Malone, but it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art of raw text to have a data field because the information is waiting to be processed by a user.

In regard to claim 16, Zarmer nor Fujisawa disclosed "wherein the data field contains a data attribute" was not disclosed by Zarmer nor Fujisawa.

Malone disclosed this in **column 18, lines 40-49**. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of data attributes at the time the invention was made to have a data field and to combine Zarmer's extraction of attribute data and Fujisawa's text format with Malone's data field containing a data attribute because the attributes can customize which paragraphs are displayed for a document in a hierarchical tree-structure.

In regard to claim 17, Zarmer nor Fujisawa disclosed "wherein the data attribute is an author name" was not disclosed by Zarmer nor Fujisawa.

Malone disclosed this in **column 13, lines 51-63, column 15, lines 24-38, and figures 4 and 15**. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of data attributes at the time the invention was made for the attribute to be an author name and to combine Zarmer's electronic document and Fujisawa's first format with Malone's author's name being a data attribute because the attribute customizes the name of the sender of an e-mail message.

In regard to claim 18, Zarmer nor Fujisawa did not disclose "wherein the data attribute is a publication date" was not disclosed by Zarmer nor Fujisawa.

Malone disclosed this in **column 13, lines 6-20 and column 16, lines 31-47**. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of publication dates at the time the invention was made for the attribute to be a publication date and to combine Zarmer's attribute data and Fujisawa's text format with Malone's data attribute being a publication date because the user can perform a search through a document collection to find when the document was first published by the author.

In regard to claim 19, "wherein the data attribute is a word count" was not disclosed by Zarmer, Fujisawa, nor Malone, but it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of data attributes at the time the invention was made to have a word count because a document is formatted according to the number of words contained in the text of the word processing document that will fit on a page.

In regard to claim 20, wherein the data attribute is an annotation" was not disclosed by Zarmer, Fujisawa, nor Malone, but it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of annotations at the time the invention was made for the data attribute to be an annotation because an annotation is used as an attachment to part of a document that provides a comment or explanation related to the document contents.

In regard to claim 21, "wherein the data attribute is a keyword" was not disclosed by Zarmer nor Fujisawa.

Malone disclosed this in **column 10, lines 4-40**. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of using keywords at the time the invention was made to have a data attribute and to combine Zarmer's collection of documents and Fujisawa's text format with Malone's keyword being a data attribute because keywords have a special meaning when performing searches. For example, the U.S. Patent Office's automated search and retrieval system uses keywords for searching and retrieving information and related documents.

In regard to claim 22, "wherein the data attribute is an image type" was not disclosed by Zarmer nor Fujisawa.

Malone disclosed this in **column 19, lines 6-26**. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of image types at the time the invention was made to have a data attribute and to combine Zarmer's first document format and Fujisawa's image format with Malone's image type being a data attribute because the attribute of the image in word processing and graphics programs can be a thumbnail (often referred to as a thumbprint) of a document designed to fit in the corner of the computer screen.

In regard to claim 23, "wherein the data attribute is an image dimension" was not disclosed by Zarmer nor Fujisawa.

Malone disclosed this in **column 20, lines 8-18**. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of image dimensions at the time the invention was made to have a data attribute that is an image dimension and to combine Zarmer's data structure and Fujisawa's first format being an image format with Malone's image dimension being a data attribute because in word processing and graphics programs a document image can be sized to be either full-scale or to be a thumbnail of the document.

In regard to claim 24, "wherein the data attribute is meta-text with positioning information" was not disclosed by Zarmer, Fujisawa, nor Malone, but it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of meta-text at the time the invention was made to have positioning information because meta-text refers to the attributes of a document and identifies where the document is to be located in the hierarchical document collection.

In regard to claim 25, "comprising the step of extracting indexing information from the attribute data in the data structure" was not disclosed by Zarmer, Fujisawa, nor Malone, but it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of extracting indexing information at the time the invention was made to have a data structure because documents in a document collection have stored attributes relating to the document.

In regard to claim 26, "monitoring modifications to the document," "extracting updated indexing information, and updating the attribute data contained in the data structure based on the updated indexing information" was not disclosed by Zarmer, Fujisawa, nor Malone, but it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of document modifications at the time the invention was made to extract the updated indexing information and to updated the attribute data because in an indexing database a comparison is made of the search terms initiated by a user.

Claim 27 is rejected on the same basis as above for claim 15.

In regard to claim 28, "identify the document from amongst other documents in the document collection utilizing the indexing information" was not disclosed by Zarmer nor Fujisawa.

Malone disclosed this in **column 1, lines 52-67 and column 2, lines 1-2**. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of document identification at the time the invention was made to combine Zarmer's hierarchy of electronic folders and Fujisawa's file name

with Malone's indexing information because the indexing database stores the keywords or attributes that are associated with the documents in the document collection.

In regard to claim 30, "electronically analyzing the attribute data stored in the data structure corresponding to the document" and determining whether the document is to be automatically linked to the first electronic folder, based on the electronic analysis of the attribute data stored in the data structure" was not disclosed by Zarmer, Fujisawa, nor Malone, but it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of analyzing data attributes at the time the invention was made to have a stored data structure because for example, in Lotus Notes and Microsoft Windows '98 a user can generate the data from document storage and depending on the document contents the user can decide whether to link the folder to the next folder in the hierarchy.

"Identifying the document on an inclusion list if it is determined that the document is not automatically linked to the first document" was not disclosed by Zarmer, Fujisawa, nor Malone, but it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of document identification at the time the invention was made to have an inclusion list because the list identifies documents that are excluded during the categorization process and are not associated with an electronic folder.

Claim 31 is rejected on the same basis as above for claim 30.

In regard to claim 32, "monitoring the document modifications" was not disclosed by Zarmer nor Fujisawa.

Malone disclosed this in **column 3, lines 63-67 and column 4, lines 1-55**. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of document modifications at the time the invention was made to monitor the modifications and to combine Zarmer's attribute data and Fujisawa's electronic document importing with Malone's monitoring document modifications because the user can change the document data by making additions or deletions to the document contents.

"Automatically linking the document to a second electronic folder if a document modification causes the attribute data to match a set of predefined criteria corresponding to the second electronic folder" was not disclosed by Zarmer, Fujisawa, nor Malone, but it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of document linking at the time the invention was made to match the predefined criteria because if a user modifies the contents of the document this will change users the created links to the folders in the hierarchy.

Claim 33 is rejected on the same basis as above for claim 32.

In regard to claim 34, "wherein the attribute data is a document title " was not disclosed by Zarmer nor Fujisawa.

Malone disclosed this in **column 25, lines 2-31 and figure 2 (document entitled "BUG FIX REQUEST")**. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of document modifications at the time the invention was made to have a document title and to combine Zarmer's first format and Fujisawa's file name with Malone's document title because the document has the attributes associated with the title or heading of the e-mail messages.

Claim 35 is rejected on the same basis as above for claim 17.

In regard to claim 36, "wherein the attribute data is a phrase associated with the document" was not disclosed by Zarmer nor Fujisawa.

Malone disclosed this in **column 21, lines 50-63, column 28, lines 37-57, and figure 16.** It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of phrases at the time the invention was made to have the phrase associated with the document and to combine Zarmer's data structure and Fujisawa's text format with Malone's attribute data because the attribute data is a fragment corresponding to the document in the indexing database storage.

Claim 37 is rejected on the same basis as above for claim 21.

In regard to claim 38, "wherein the data attribute is a common concept" was not disclosed by Zarmer, Fujisawa, nor Malone, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of common concepts at the time the invention was made to have a data attribute because a search allows a user to retrieve documents matching the attribute data including text, metadata and the format of the document in the collection.

In regard to claim 39, "automatically manipulating the document based on a predefined behavior associated with the first electronic folder" was not disclosed by Zarmer, Fujisawa, nor Malone, but it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of document manipulation at the time the invention was made to have a first electronic folder because a user can program a folder with particular characteristics relating to the folder contents.

In regard to claim 40, "wherein the predefined behavior is user-defined behavior" was not disclosed by Zarmer nor Fujisawa.

Malone disclosed this in **column 3, lines 26-67 and column 4, lines 1-55**. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of user-predefined behavior at the time the invention was made to have user-defined behavior and to combine Zarmer's data structure and Fujisawa's data attributes with Malone's predefined behavior because the user can program the folder to perform certain functions when the documents are linked to a hierarchical folder in a managed document collection.

In regard to claim 41,"wherein the predefined behavior involves e-mailing the document to a preprogrammed e-mail address" was not disclosed by Zarmer nor Fujisawa.

Malone disclosed this in **column 11, lines 42-64 and column 12, lines 53-60**. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of predefined behavior at the time the invention was made to e-mail a document to a preprogrammed e-mail address and to combine Zarmer's electronic document and Fujisawa's image format with Malone's preprogrammed e-mail address because the user has the capability to e-mail all of the documents that are stored in a folder to a particular recipient's e-mail address. This can be performed in Lotus Notes cc: Mail or any other e-mail program.

In regard to claim 42, "wherein the predefined behavior involves providing controlled access to the document" was not disclosed by Zarmer, Fujisawa, nor Malone, but it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of predefined behavior at the time the

invention was made to have controlled access because a user has the capability to program the folder according to the users specifications.

In regard to claim 43, "linking the document to a folder, wherein the folder has associated with it a predefined behavior and automatically manipulating the document in accordance with the predefined behavior" was not disclosed by Zarmer, Fujisawa, nor Malone, but it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of document manipulation at the time the invention was made to have a folder and to manipulate it automatically because certain tasks are performed when the documents are linked to folder which are initiated by the user.

Claim 44 is rejected on the same basis as above for claim 40.

Claim 45 is rejected on the same basis as above for claim 41.

Claim 46 is rejected on the same basis as above for claim 42.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zarmer et al (US 5,625,818), hereafter Zarmer.

In regard to claim 51, "importing a document into a collection of documents in a computer-based system, wherein the collection of documents is organized within the computer-

based system in accordance with a hierarchy of electronic folders" (**column 6, lines 19-40**), "storing the document in a memory location" (**column 7, in particular lines 18-27, column 12, lines 41-48, and column 18, lines 17-23**), "automatically extracting attribute data from the document" (**column 18, lines 24-34**) and "generating a data structure corresponding to the document" (**column 23, lines 40-51 and column 24, lines 48-63**), and "linking the document to the first electronic folder" (**column 9, lines 27-42 and column 6, lines 35-40**).

"Comprising the extracted attribute data in a standardized format regardless of the document type or document format, and wherein the data structure is stored in memory separate from the document, " "predefining category criteria for a first electronic folder, wherein the first electronic folder is one of the electronic folders which make up the hierarchy of electronic folders," was not disclosed by Zarmer, but it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of extracted attribute data, data structures, and predefining category criteria at the time the invention was made to have a standardized format, a memory separate from the document, and a first electronic folder because the user has the capability to program the folder to a recognizable format according to the category and the placement of the document in the hierarchy.

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims 47-50 and 53-83 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

13. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Applicant's computer-readable storage medium with a program comprising executable steps for maintaining a second data structure including data defining a document hierarchy for a document collection in claims 47 and 80, updating the second data structure including data defining a link between the data structure of the imported document and a document hierarchy folder or category in claims 48 and 81, the second data structure including data linking all of the documents in the document collection to at least one folder or category in claims 49 and 82, maintaining a third data structure including data defining a second document hierarchy for the document collection, or a portion of the second document hierarchy and the third data structure being maintained at a local terminal connected to the computer system in claims 50 and 83, electronically analyzing the attribute data stored in the data structure corresponding to the document and determining if the document is to be automatically linked or excluded from linking to the first electronic folder based on the comparison and identifying the document on an exclusion list if a determination is made that the document is not to be excluded from linking to the first electronic folder in claims 53 and 54, the step of predefining category criteria for the first electronic folder comprising the steps of storing and analyzing a seed document in the first electronic folder, and extracting category criteria from the seed document in claim 55, the predefined category criteria being based on user-defined criteria in claim 56, monitoring the document modifications and linking the document to a second electronic folder if the document modification and the attribute data matches a set of predefined criteria corresponding to the

second electronic folder in claim 57, the attribute data being a document title, a document author, a phrase associated with the document, a common concept, and a keyword in claims 59-63, linking the document with an electronic folder and manipulating the document automatically based on a predefined behavior associated with the first electronic folder in claim 64, the predefined behavior involves e-mailing the document to a preprogrammed e-mail address and providing controlled access to the document in claims 65-67, the step of importing a document into the computer-based system comprising the executable steps of generating program instructions causing an optical scanner connected to the computer system to optically scan the document with the document being a paper-based document and converting the optically scanned document into an electronic document in claim 68, the electronic document being an image file, a text file, a word processing document, contains an image, is an e-mail, and is an HTML format in claims 69-75, extracting indexing information and updated indexing information from the attribute data in the data structure and monitoring modifications to the document in claims 76 and 77, the attribute data being derived from a data field in the data structure comprising raw text data in claim 78, and identifying the document from among the other documents stored in the computer system utilizing the indexing information in claim 79, would not have been shown by the prior art of record, would not have been obvious over the prior art of record, nor would have been fairly suggested by the prior art of record.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Roth et al (5,878,422) disclosed fields, first and second formats, data files, and a data structure.

Mehrle (5,794,236) disclosed a computer-based system for classifying a hierarchy of documents and linking the classifications.

Pirolli et al (5,895,470) disclosed categorizing a linked collection of documents.

Bruffey et al (4,945,475) disclosed a hierarchical file system and retrieval of data.

Lerissa et al (5,949,413) disclosed e-mail, a database, folders, and an index.

Jones et al (5,684,984) disclosed archiving, a folder-like hierarchy, and document behaviors.

Morita et al (5,832,470) disclosed document classification with documents in a hierarchy of folders.

Marmel, Elaine, "Easy Lotus Notes Release 4.0," disclosed searching, importing data, creating categories, linking documents, creating folders, formatting, and assigning categories, pages 50, 73, 433, 728, 735, and 736.

Russel, Charlie and Crawford, Sharon, "Windows '98 Complete," disclosed bitmaps, archiving e-mail, browsing, folders, deleting folders, e-mail with HTML, and searching, pages 15, 21-23, 37, 40, 41, 49-51, 102, 103, 142-144, and 148-152.

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

INQUIRIES

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is (703)308-7064. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 6:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black, can be reached on (703)305-9707.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703)308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry).

Or:

(703)308-5403 (for informal or draft communications, please label **"PROPOSED"** or **"DRAFT"**).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, Virginia., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-9600.

Colbert
September 14, 1999

Paul R. Lintz
Primary Examiner